Serial Number: 10/604,470
Filed: 7/23/2003

Remarks

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-18.

The Examiner rejected claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Locati* in view of *Rath*. The Examiner admits that *Locati* does not teach the claimed limitation of interleaved concentric threads and supplies *Rath* therefore. *Rath* is a mechanical fastener, used for example for joining metal panels of an aircraft frame (col. 2, lines 44-48).

The Examiner suggests it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify a coaxial electrical connector according to the mechanical fastener *Rath* "in order to reduce assembling time". Applicant respectfully submits *Rath* is merely a screw taken from a non-analogous art and has nothing whatsoever to do with the interconnection of a rear clamp nut and an associated coaxial electrical connector body according to the invention. Therefore, the Examiner's cited combination is improper.

Further, the Examiner's cited basis for the combination fails to appear in *Rath*. *Rath* discloses only "a double lead thread is used for advancing a double lead fastener twice as far per revolution as a single lead thread" (col 2, lines 40-42). Reduction of assembly time is an Examiner inference, not a teaching appearing in *Rath*. Therefore, the required showing in the prior art supporting the Examiner's cited combination fails to appear.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital* 732 F.2d 1572, 1577 (Fed.Cir. 1984). Absent a showing in the prior art the Examiner has impermissibly used 'hindsight' occasioned by the applicant's teaching to hunt through the prior art for the claimed elements and combined them as claimed. *In re Zurko* 111 F.3d 887 (Fed.Cir.1997). Therefore, rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner objected to claims 21-26 as dependent upon a rejected base claim and indicated that claims 21-26 would be allowable if placed into independent form. Because the base claim 19 is believed to be allowable, as described herein above in detail, these claims should also be allowable in their present form.

Serial Number: 10/604,470
Filed: 7/23/2003

BABCOCK IP

Having obviated each of the Examiners rejections, applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Should the Examiner be inclined to issue an Official Action other than the notice of allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner first contact Applicant by telephone at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Babcock, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, LLC
24154 Lakeside Dr.
Lake Zurich, IL 60047
Telephone: 847 719-2063
Fax: 847 438-5743

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No 703 872-9306) on May 24, 2005.

Andrew D. Babcock